



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,890	10/01/2001	Akira Yamaguchi	Q63866	3508
7590	04/18/2006		EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS			NGUYEN, KIMNHUNG T	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20037			2629	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/965,890	YAMAGUCHI, AKIRA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kimnhung Nguyen	2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed on 11/3/05.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-18,20-24 and 27-33 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-18,20-24 and 27-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

This Application has been examined. The claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24, and 27-33 are pending.

The examination results are as following.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mayer, III et al. (US 6,690,337).

Regarding claim 29, Mayer, III et al. discloses in fig. 3A, an image display system comprising:

a plurality of flat panel displays (202, 204, 206); a casing (201, see col. 3, lines 47-50) for integrally accommodating the plurality of flat panel displays; a power source common to the plurality of flat panel displays (see col. 4, lines 36-39); and a control unit for controlling the plurality of flat panels displays, wherein the control unit is incorporated in the casing (chassis 201, see col. 4, lines 36-43), the control unit controlling the plurality of flat panel displays, and wherein the control unit controls image data signals displayed on the plurality of flat panel displays.

Regarding claim 30, Mayer III discloses further in fig. 3A, wherein a plurality of flat panel displays are substantially aligned in a common plane (see displays 202, 204, 206 are in the chassis 201).

Regarding claim 31, Mayer, III, discloses further in fig. 3A, wherein each of the plurality of flat panel displays has a viewing direction normal to a viewing surface and wherein viewing directions of the plurality of flat panel displays are substantially parallel (fig. 3A).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer, II et al. (US 6,690,337).

Regarding claim 1, Mayer, II et al. discloses in figure 3A, an image display system comprising a plurality of flat panel displays (202, 204, 206); a casing for integrally accommodating said plurality of flat panel displays; a power source common to said plurality of flat panel displays (see column 4, lines 36-39); and a control unit for controlling said plurality of flat displays (see col. 4, lines 36-39). The control unit is incorporated in the casing (see col. 4, lines 38-39).

However, Mayer, II et al. does not disclose that the image display system, wherein a display screen size in a diagonal line direction is 10 inches to 25 inches, a pixel size is 50 micrometers to 240 micrometers, the number of pixels is 600 pixels x 1600 pixels or more, and aspect ratio is 1 to 4/3.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have display screen size in a diagonal line direction is 10 inches to 25 inches, a pixel size is 50 micrometers to 240 micrometers, the number of pixels is 600 pixels x 1600 pixels or more, and aspect ratio is 1 to 4/3 as claimed since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the range of the system. A change in range is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

See In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1995) and

See In re Raven, 156 USPQ 679 (CCPA).

Regarding claims 4-5, Mayer, III et al. discloses in fig. 3A, the control unit comprises at least one or more control devices (202-206) connected from an outside of the casing and a control device incorporated in the casing, the control device controlling one or more of the plurality of a flat panel displays (see col. 4, lines 36-55).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2629

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 6, 9-11, 15, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer, III et al. (US 6,690,337) in view of Suzuki (US patent 6,344,836).

Mayer, III et al. discloses in figure 3A, an image display system comprising a plurality of flat panel displays; a casing for integrally accommodating said plurality of flat panel displays); a power source common to said plurality of flat panel displays as discussed.

However, Mayer, III et al. does not disclose the control unit has one function for moving an image displayed on each of said plurality of flat panel displays, the number of pixels, and for displaying the color image, and at least one of an image obtained by enlarging the display image, and wherein each of said plurality of flat panel displays is a liquid crystal display.

Suzuki does disclose the control unit has one function for moving an image displayed on each of said plurality of flat panel displays (see function of moving cursor, see column 6, lines 21-30), the number of pixels (see column 5, lines 34-40), and for displaying the color image (see display 30 each pixel having 24-bit color or 16,777, 216 colors, see col. 5, lines 38-42) and an inherent at least one of an image obtained by enlarging the display image, and wherein each of said plurality of flat panel displays is a liquid crystal display (see column 5, lines 63-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of function of moving cursor the number of pixels, and for displaying the color image and wherein each of said plurality of flat panel displays is a liquid crystal display as taught by Suzuki into the display system of Mayer, III et al. because this would

provide to the user the size for drawing and information to be displayed on the display system (see column 5, lines 34-43).

7. Claims 2, 8, 16-18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer, III et al. (US 6,690,337) in view of Inbar (US patent 6,119,380).

Regarding claims 2, 8, Mayer, III et al. discloses in figure 4, an image display system comprising a plurality of flat panel displays; a casing for integrally accommodating said plurality of flat panel displays; a power source common to said plurality of flat panel displays as discussed.

However, Mayer, III et al. does not disclose the plurality of flat panel displays has a holding unit for holding a medical film. Inbar discloses a medical X-ray transparencies comprising a like box (medical film), the transparencies constructed under a spring-load film-holder clips located along the top edge of the viewing surface (see column 1, lines 22-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the a medical X-ray transparencies comprising a like box (medical film), the transparencies constructed under a spring-load film-holder clips located along the top edge of the viewing surface as taught by Inbar into the system of Mayer, III et al. because this would provide to the user to hold the medical film more stable in the display system.

Regarding claims 16-18, Mayer, III et al. does not disclose the system comprising a medical diagnostic apparatus connected to the control unit.

Inbar discloses in fig. 6, a medical diagnostic apparatus (see medical X-ray transparencies comprising a like box or medical film, see col. 1, lines 22-24, col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the medical diagnostic apparatus as taught by Inbar into the system of Mayer, III because this would utilize one or a small number of high intensity high efficiency light sources (see col. 3, lines 62-65), which used for treatment of the patients in the hospital.

Regarding claim 32, Mayer, III does not disclose the medical image display system further comprising a luminance measurement apparatus, which measures a luminance gradation characteristic of each of the plurality of flat panel displays.

Inbar discloses in fig. 6, the display system comprising a luminance measurement apparatus (see medical X-ray transparencies, see col. 1, lines 22-24, col. 3, lines 62-67 and col. 4, lines 1-3), which measures a luminance gradation characteristic of each of the plurality of flat panel displays (see system display 1000, fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the display system comprising a luminance measurement apparatus as taught by Inbar into the system of Mayer, III because this would utilize one or a small number of high intensity high efficiency light sources (see col. 3, lines 62-65), which used for treatment of the patients in the hospital.

8. Claim 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer, III et al. (US patent 6,690,337) in view of Yishida et al. (US patent 5,617,112).

Mayer, III et al. does not disclose the maximum luminance values and the minimum values of the display control. Yoshida et al. discloses the maximum luminance values and the minimum values of the display control (see figure 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using the maximum luminance values as taught by Yoshida et al. in the device of Mayer, III et al. because this would have an optimal value of brightness of the display device is determined to perform display brightness control.

9. Claims 13-14, 20-23 and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Mayer, III et al. (US 6,690,337) in view of Berman et al. (US patent 6,448,956).

Regarding claims 13-14, 20-23 and 27-28, Mayer III, et al. does not disclose that the image display comprising an output is a hard copy and is a dry printer, and hard copy is a medical film. Berman et al. discloses a medical system having light boxes to view X-ray prints and could handle “hard” prints (hard copy or dry printer) in front of a light box (see column 1, lines 43-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of using an input is hard copy is a dry printer as taught by Berman into the display system of Mayer, III et al. because this would direct the image manipulation capabilities in the field of teleradiology and radiology (see column 1, lines 55-59), which used in the hospital.

10. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mayer, III et al. (US 6,690,337) and Suzuki (US 6,344,836) as applied to claims 1 and 9 above, and further in view of Inbar (US 6,119,380).

Mayer, III et al. discloses in figure 3A, an image display system comprising a plurality of flat panel displays (202, 204, 206); a casing for integrally accommodating said plurality of flat panel displays; a power source common to said plurality of flat panel displays (see column 4, lines 36-39); and a control unit for controlling said plurality of flat displays (see col. 4, lines 36-39). The control unit is incorporated in the casing (see col. 4, lines 38-39).

Suzuki discloses the plurality of flat panel displays for displaying the color image (see display 30 each pixel having 24-bit color or 16,777, 216 colors, see col. 5, lines 38-42).

However, Mayer, III et al. and Suzuki do not disclose the display system, wherein an image to be displayed is determined from a kind of diagnostic apparatus with which the image is obtained.

Inbar discloses in fig. 6, a medical diagnostic apparatus (see medical X-ray apparatus, see col. 1, lines 22-24, col. 3, lines 62-67, and col. 4, lines 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the medical diagnostic apparatus as taught by Inbar into the system of Mayer, III and Suzuki because this would utilize one or a small number of high intensity high efficiency light sources (see col. 3, lines 62-65), which used for treatment of the patients in the hospital.

***Response To Arguments***

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-18, 20-24, and 27-33 filed on 11/3/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states that, "Mayer fails to disclose or suggest a control unit incorporated in the casing, as claimed. In the sections of the reference cited by the Examiners Mayer merely discloses that the control unit may be either it mounted on" the chassis 201, the base 212 or the support 210 and does not disclose that the control unit is incorporated in the casing, as claimed. Col. 4, lines 38-43. Even if one argues that Mayer discloses "a multi-panel video display including an integrated control unit" the reference still does not disclose that the control unit is incorporated in a casing. A control unit which is fixedly attached via cable to the multi-panel video display may still be integral to the multi-panel display, but still not incorporated in the casing".

Examiner respectively disagrees because Mayer discloses a control unit incorporated in the casing (see chassis 201, see col. 4, lines 36-39) as discussed above, that is the same meaning of a control unit mounted in the casing, because a control unit incorporated in the casing or a control unit mounted in the casing which also lies in the housing to control the plurality of flat displays. For these reasons, the rejections are maintained.

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimnhung Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7698. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI, FROM 8:30 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimnhung Nguyen  
April 12, 2006



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600